PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number:	10/685,192
Filing Date:	10/14/2003
Applicant(s):	Duncan L. Mewherter, Amy D. Travis, Koah-Hsing Wang and Robert C. Weir
Entitled:	RETRIEVING SLIDE SHOW CONTENT FROM PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS
Examiner:	Debrow, James J.
Group Art Unit:	2176
Attorney Docket No.:	LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith is Appellant's Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal filed concurrently herewith in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed August 1, 2008 (the "New Non-Final Office Action"). As this Appeal Brief has been timely filed within the two-month shortened statutory period, no extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required. Notwithstanding, please charge any shortage in fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17, 41.20, and in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account **12-2158**, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: November 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Greenberg/
Steven M. Greenberg
Registration No. 44,725
Customer Number 46321

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number:	10/685,192
Filing Date:	10/14/2003
Applicant(s):	Duncan L. Mewherter, Amy D. Travis, Koah-Hsing Wang and Robert C. Weir
Entitled:	RETRIEVING SLIDE SHOW CONTENT FROM PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS
Examiner:	Debrow, James J.
Group Art Unit:	2176
Attorney Docket No.:	LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed concurrently herewith, wherein Appellants appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 through 22.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is assigned to International Business Machines Corporation by assignment recorded on October 14, 2003, at Reel 014611, Frame 0968.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant is unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 through 22 are pending in this Application and have been three-times rejected. It is from the multiple rejections of claims 1 through 22 that this Appeal is taken.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims were amended in the Amendment of September 5, 2007.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claims 1 through 22 are respectively directed to a system, method and apparatus for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application such as a Web conferencing or virtual classroom application. In Appellants' invention, a slide show presentation in its native format can be processed to extract slide title information for each slide in the slide show presentation. Additionally, important text within the slide further can be extracted. Each slide in the slide-show can be converted to a raster image and disposed within markup. The markup can be annotated with the important text and both the markup and the slide title can be provided to the non-presentation application for use in concert with the non-presentation application. In this way, the context of each slide can be preserved for use within the non-presentation application as can an image of each slide itself.

With reference to independent claim 1 and in accordance with the Appellants' invention, a system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications can include a slide show (Figure 1, Element 120) produced by a slide show presentation application (Figure 1, Element 110) and stored in a native format (Page 10, lines 11-13). The system also can include a slide show conversion process (Figure 1, Element 200) configured for coupling to a non-presentation application (Figure 1, Element 150) and programmed both to extract contextual data (Figure 1, Element 130) from said slide show in its native format (Page 10, lines 11-13), and also to convert associated slides in said slide show to raster imagery (Figure 1, Element 140) for use in said non-presentation application (Figure 1, Element 150).

With reference to independent claim 6, a method for converting a slide show presentation can be provided for use within a non-presentation application. The method can include extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Block 220). The method also can include converting the first slide into a raster image. (Page 10, Par 3, Figure 2, Block 230) The method yet further can include disposing both the slide title and the raster image in a markup language document. (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Blocks 235 and 240) Finally, the method can include repeating the extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation. (Page 11, Par 1, Figure 2, Blocks 255 through 260).

With reference to independent claim 16, a machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for converting a slide show presentation can be provided for use within a non-presentation application. The computer program can include a routine set of

instructions which when executed by a machine perform steps including extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Block 220), converting the first slide into a raster image (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Block 230), disposing both the slide title and the raster image in a markup language document (Page 10, Par 3, Figure 2, Blocks 235 and 240) and repeating the extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation. (Page 11, Par 1, Figure 2, Blocks 255 through 260).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Examiner's objection to the specification under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1)--namely claim 16 and the use of the term "machine readable storage".

2. Claims 1 through 5 are statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

3. Claims 1 and 5 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0202349 by Erol et al. (Erol).

4. Claims 2-4, 6 through 9, 12, 14 through 19 and 22 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) over Erol in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0194035 by Chakraborty.

5. Claims 10, 11, 13, 20, 21 and 22 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) over Erol in view of Chakraborty and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,162,691 to Chatterjee et al. (Chatterjee).

VII. THE ARGUMENT

THE OBJECTION TO CLAIM 16 UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.75(D)(1)

On page 3 of the New Non-Final Office Action, Examiner objects to the use of the term "machine readable storage" in claim 16. Specifically, Examiner states,

> The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01 (0). Correction of the following is required: the recited "machine readable storage" of Claim 16. The Specification does not mention the recited "machine readable storage." Thus, there is no support or antecedent basis for the recited "machine readable storage" that allows the meaning of the term to be ascertained, as required in 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Appellants interpret Examiner's objection to fall under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph requires that the specification of the patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.[1] Additionally, the scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the disclosure.[2] However, enablement is also not precluded even if some experimentation is necessary, although the amount of experimentation needed must not be unduly excessive.[3] *The factual inquiry for determining whether a specification provides sufficient written description for the claimed invention is whether the specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed.*[4]

An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures,

---

[1] Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997)
[2] Id.
[3] Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 802 F.2d 1367, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
[4] Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention.[5] Appellants' claim 16 recites a "machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application." As set forth in claim 16, the computer program includes a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the same steps of claim 6 which is a method claim recited steps for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application. Of note, the term "machine readable storage" is a term well-known in the art which has a plain meaning commonly associated with a storage medium able to be read by a machine such as a computer.

Examples abound in issued U.S. Patents including U.S. Patent No. 7,117,098 for "Machine-readable storage medium for analyzing distribution of macromolecules between the cell membrane and the cell cytoplasm" and U.S. Patent No. 5,978, 762 for "Digitally encoded machine readable storage media using adaptive bit allocation in frequency, time and over multiple channels". Further, a basic "Google" search will reveal over 740,000 documents referencing "machine readable storage" also in accordance with the plain meaning of "machine readable storage". Indeed, even Wikipedia ascribes an identical understanding of the term "machine readable storage" as

> The term machine-readable (or computer-readable) refers to information encoded in a form which can be, read (i.e., scanned/sensed) by a machine/computer and interpreted by the machine's hardware and/or software. Theoretically, anything that can be read, can be read by machines, but not necessarily comprehended by machines.

Appellants' usage of the term "machine readable storage" also is consistent with the ordinary meaning of "machine readable storage" as evidenced by pages 11 and 12 of Appellants'

[5] Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1997)

originally filed specification. Specifically, pages 11 and 12 of Appellants' originally filed specification provide,

> A typical combination of hardware and software could be a general purpose computer system with a **computer program that, when being loaded and executed**, controls the computer system such that it carries out the methods described herein. **The present invention can also be embedded in a computer program product**, which comprises all the features enabling the implementation of the methods described herein, and which, when loaded in a computer system is able to carry out these methods.
>
> Computer program or application in the present context means any expression, in any language, code or notation, of a **set of instructions intended to cause a system having an information processing capability to perform a particular function** either directly or after either or both of the following a) conversion to another language, code or notation; b) reproduction in a different material form.

It is inherent to a computer program when the computer program is loaded that the computer program must be stored in a storage that is machine readable. Thus, Appellants' specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed using the term "machine readable storage".

THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 THROUGH 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

On pages 3 and 4 of the New Non-Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 1 (and by extension, claims 2 through 5) under 35 U.S.C. 101 because Examiner believes the claimed invention to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, Examiner states in part,

> The claimed invention is considered functional descriptive material (software), per se, which is not statutory. Functional descriptive material claimed in combination with an appropriate computer readable medium to enable the functionality to be realized is patent eligible subject matter if it is capable of producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result when used in a computer system.

Claim 1 recites a system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications. As recited in claim 1, the system includes a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format, and a slide show conversion process configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to **extract**

contextual data from said slide show in its native format, and also **to convert associated slides in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application**.

Of note, M.P.E.P. 2106(IV)(C)(2) sets forth

> A claimed invention is directed to a practical application of a 35 U.S.C. 101 judicial exception when it:
>
> (A) "transforms" an article or physical object to a different state or thing; or
>
> (B) otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, based on the factors discussed below.

Of substantial importance, M.P.E.P. 2106(IV)(C)(2)(1) provides in pertinent part, "USPTO personnel first shall review the claim and determine if it provides a transformation or reduction of an article to a different state or thing. If USPTO personnel find such a transformation or reduction, USPTO personnel **shall end the inquiry and find that the claim meets the statutory requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101**." Applicants have clearly established that the slide show conversion process both extracts data from a slide show in its native format, and also converts associated slides in the slide show to raster imagery--a blatent transformation of a an article or physical object to a different state or thing.

Appellants' analysis is directly supported by the most recent holding by the Federal Circuit in Ex Parte Bilski[6] in which the Federal Circuit acknowledged that any claim reciting an algorithm or process (much as the case is with the second limitation of Appellants' claim 1) can state statutory subject matter when the claim operates to transform an article or physical object to a different state or thing.[7] In any event, for some time M.P.E.P. 2106.01 has provided strong support for the statutory nature of Appellants' claims 1 through 5. Specifically, M.P.E.P. 2106.01 provides in part,

[6] 2008 U.S. App. LEXIS 22479, 45-46 (Fed. Cir. 2008)

[7] Id. citing In re Comiskey, 499 F.3d 1365, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2007)

> Computer programs are often recited as part of a claim. USPTO personnel should determine whether the computer program is being claimed as part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. **In such a case, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program is included in the claim. The same result occurs when a computer program is used in a computerized process where the computer executes the instructions set forth in the computer program.** Only when the claimed invention taken as a whole is directed to a mere program listing, i.e., to only its description or expression, is it descriptive material per se and hence nonstatutory.

The clear claim language of Appellants' claim 1 in which a slide show conversion process is both configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and also is programmed both to extract contextual data from a slide show in its native format, and yet further to convert associated slides in the slide show to raster imagery for use in the non-presentation application falls well within the guidelines outlined above.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY EROL

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claim 5 stands or falls together with independent claim 1.

The factual determination of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure, either explicitly or inherently, of each element of a claimed invention in a single reference.[8] Moreover, the anticipating prior art reference must describe the recited invention with sufficient clarity and detail to establish that the claimed limitations existed in the prior art and that such existence would be recognized by one having ordinary skill in the art.[9] Absence from an allegedly anticipating prior art reference of any claimed element negates anticipation.[10]

---

[8] In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently"), In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993); Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); Perkin-Elmer Corp. v. Computervision Corp., 732 F.2d 888, 894, 221 USPQ 669, 673 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

[9] See In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990); Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps Inc., 850 F.2d 675, 678, 7 USPQ2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

[10] Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc., 793 F.2d 1565, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1986)(emphasis added).

On page 4 and 5 of the New Non-Final Office Action, Examiner argues that Erol provides every claimed element in claims 1 and 5. Appellants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 in its entirety recites,

> A system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications, the system comprising:
>
> a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,
>
> a **slide show conversion process** configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and **programmed both** to extract contextual data from said slide show in its native format, and **also** to convert associated slides in said slide show to **raster imagery** for use in said non-presentation application.

Integral to claim 1is the extraction of contextual data from a slide show in its native format and also the conversion of associated slides in the slide show to raster imagery. Raster imagery, is a well known term of art, as will be evidenced by Wikipedia:

> In computer graphics, a raster graphics image or bitmap, is a data structure representing a generally rectangular grid of pixels, or points of color, viewable via a monitor, paper, or other display medium. Raster images are stored in image files with varying formats (see Comparison of graphics file formats).
>
> A bitmap corresponds bit-for-bit with an image displayed on a screen, generally in the same format used for storage in the display's video memory, or maybe as a device-independent bitmap. Bitmap is technically characterized by the width and height of the image in pixels and by the number of bits per pixel (a color depth, which determines the number of colors it can represent).

Appellants' usage of the term "raster imagery" in Appellants' specification is entirely consistent with the well known meaning of "raster imagery".

Specifically, at paragraph [0008] of Appellants' specification, Appellants write, "By generating a bit-mapped raster representation, however, the content of the slide show becomes an ordinary image and any internal meaning will have become lost." Importantly, during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation

consistent with the specification,"[11] and the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach.[12] Examiner has applied an unduly broad and actually contrarian meaning to the term "raster imagery" in comparing claim 1 to paragraphs [0111] and [0118] of Erol. Specifically, paragraphs [0111] and [0118] of Erol exclusively relate to optical character recognition in which raster imagery of a document is converted into textual data. As demonstrated with the emphasized portions of the complete reproduction of both paragraphs herein:

> [0111] The similarity of two images can be computed based on their text content. The text content of an image can be obtained by using Optical Character Recognition (OCR). OCR is well known in the literature and commercial packages exist that perform OCR on images. If a slide image (i.e., image containing slide presentation information) is obtained from a known source, for example from a PowerPoint file or an HTML page, it is also possible **to extract text from that file** by decoding the syntax of the PowerPoint file or the HTML page. Once the text is extracted, the distance between an input image, Iinput, and each of the images in the set of candidate images {S} can be computed based on the edit distances between the extracted texts. The image in {S} that has the minimum distance to Iinput is declared to be the matching image, Imatch. The distance of Imatch to Iinput is called MinDistance. A match confidence score, Cm, may also be computed as explained above. Metadata may also be output by the OCR-string matching technique. For example, the metadata may include the number of characters that are extracted from the image ("string length").
>
> [0118] **Text extraction from pictures of slides** can have some other useful applications as well. For example, based on the analysis of the OCR output, a list of topics that a person is interested in can be automatically compiled. A list of other relevant topics and presentations can be retrieved automatically based on a person's interests.

Erol provides a teaching of converting raster imagery into non-raster imagery (text). Yet, the plain language of claim 1 (and also claims 6 and 16) require the conversion of contextual data (non-raster imagery) in a slide show into raster imagery--the opposite of the teachings of Erol.

---

[11] In re ICON Health and Fitness, Inc., 496 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2007) ("[T]he PTO must give claims their broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification. Therefore, we look to the specification to see if it provides a definition for claim terms, but otherwise apply a broad interpretation."); In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

[12] In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999)

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2-4, 6 THROUGH 9, 12, 14 THROUGH 19 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER EROL IN VIEW OF CHAKRABORTY, THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10, 11, 13, 20, 21 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A) OVER EROL IN VIEW OF CHAKRABORTY AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF CHATTERJEE.

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 2 through 4, 7 through 15 and 17 through 22 stand or fall together with independent claims 1, 6 and 16, respectively.

Obviousness is a legal conclusion based on underlying factual determinations of four general types, all of which must be considered by the trier of fact: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of skill in the art; (3), the differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art; and (4) any objective indicia of nonobviousness.[13] Appellants' position is that the Examiner has not properly established the underlying facts regarding (1) the scope and content of the prior art and (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. Specifically, the combination of Erol, Chakraborty and Chatterjee wholly lack any teaching directed to the extraction of contextual data from a slide show in its native format and also the conversion of associated slides in the slide show to raster imagery. As Appellants already have demonstrated, Erol provides an opposite teaching of converting contextual data of a slide into raster imagery by teaching the optical character recognition of raster imagery in a slide.

[13] See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1734, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (2007); Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966); Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264, 1270, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1750-51 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Panduit Corp. v.Dennison Mfg. Co., 810 F.2d 1561, 1566-68, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1594 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102(e) and 103(a) based upon the applied prior art are not viable. Appellants, therefore, respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102(e) and 103(a).

Date: November 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Greenberg/
Steven M. Greenberg
Registration No. 44,725
Customer Number 46321
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3020
Boca Raton, FL 33487
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Facsimile: (561) 244-1062

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Original) A system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications, the system comprising:

a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,

a slide show conversion process configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to extract contextual data from said slide show in its native format, and also to convert associated slides in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application.

2. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said contextual data comprises a slide title for each one of said associated slides.

3. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said contextual data comprises important text associated with each one of said associated slides.

4. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said slide show conversion process further comprises programming for generating a markup language document and for disposing said contextual data and said raster imagery within said markup language document.

5. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said slide show conversion process further comprises programming for reducing said raster imagery to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device.

6. (Previously Amended) A method for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application, the method comprising the steps of:

extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application;

converting said first slide into a raster image;

disposing both said slide title and said raster image in a markup language document; and,

repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

7. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the steps of:

further extracting important text from said first slide;

annotating said raster image of said first slide in said markup language document with said extracted important text; and,

further repeating said repeating, further extracting and annotating steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

8. (Original) The method of claim 6, wherein said further extracting step comprises the step of further extracting text having formatting characteristics within said first slide which emphasizes said text.

9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein said formatting characteristics comprise a point size which exceeds a threshold value.

10. (Original) The method of claim 7, wherein said annotating step comprises the step of generating an ALT tag with said important text in association with said raster image in said markup language document.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein said generating step further comprises the step of formatting said ALT tag with additional inline indicators for facilitating an audible playback of said important text in a non-presentation application.

12. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of processing said markup language document in a non-presentation application.

13. (Original) The method of claim 12, wherein said processing step comprises the step of generating an agenda with each slide title for each raster image in said markup language document.

14. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of performing each of said extracting, disposing, converting and repeating steps in externally to a slide show presentation application which produced the slide show presentation.

15. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the steps of:

reducing said raster image to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device; and,

rendering said slide title and said reduced raster image in a pervasive device display.

16. (Previously Amended) A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the steps of:

extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application;

converting said first slide into a raster image;

disposing both said slide title and said raster image in a markup language document; and,

repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

17. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 16, further comprising the steps of:

further extracting important text from said first slide;

annotating said raster image of said first slide in said markup language document with said extracted important text; and,

further repeating said repeating, further extracting and annotating steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

18. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 17, wherein said further extracting step comprises the step of further extracting text having formatting characteristics within said first slide which emphasizes said text.

19. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 18, wherein said formatting characteristics comprise a point size which exceeds a threshold value.

20. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 17, wherein said annotating step comprises the step of generating an ALT tag with said important text in association with said raster image in said markup language document.

21. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 20, wherein said generating step further comprises the step of formatting said ALT tag with additional inline indicators for facilitating an audible playback of said important text in a non-presentation application.

22. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 17, further comprising the steps of:

reducing said raster image to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device; and,

rendering said slide title and said reduced raster image in a pervasive device display.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellant in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Since Appellant is unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.